



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/451,628 11/30/99 TEPMAN

A AMAT/4285/MD

PATENT COUNSEL MS/2061  
APPLIED MATERIALS INC  
LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT  
PO BOX 450A  
SANTA CLARA CA 95052

IM22/1029

EXAMINER

ALEJANDRO MULERO, L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED: 10/29/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/451,628

Applicant(s)

TEPMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Luz L. Alejandro

Art Unit

1763

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Luz L. Alejandro.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Rob Edmonds (reg. no. 46681).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 25 October 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4 and 5.Identification of prior art discussed: Rubin et al., US 4,852,516 and Lei et al., US 6,083,321 (prior art of record).Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: the attorney pointed out that the Rubin et al. reference does not disclose an apparatus in which the process chamber can be modular. The examiner pointed out that, as broadly claimed in independent claims 1, 4 and 5, the Rubin et al. reference discloses the claimed apparatus since the claims do not require the process chamber to be modular. Also, the examiner pointed out that Lei et al. discloses modular process chambers.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required